	Case 1:20-cv-00530-JLT-CDB	Document 122	Filed 12/11/25	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	BEVERLY ALLEN, individual	•	Case No. 1:20-cv-0	00530-JLT-CDB
12	on behalf of all others similarly	situated,	ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF THE	
13	Plaintiff,			E CASE PURSUANT OF THE FEDERAL
14	V.		RULES OF CIVIL	
15	PROTECTIVE LIFE INSURAL COMPANY, et al.,	NCE	(Doc. 121)	
16	Defendants.			
17				
18	Plaintiff Beverly Allen ("Plaintiff") initiated this action with the filing of a class action			
19	complaint against Defendants Protective Life Insurance Company and Empire General Life			
20	Insurance Company ("Defendants") on April 13, 2020. (Doc. 1). On December 10, 2025, the			
21	parties filed a jointly executed stipulated dismissal with prejudice as to Plaintiff's individual claims			
22	and without prejudice as to the putative class claims. (Doc. 121).			
23	The stipulated dismissal comports with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(ii			
24	and Plaintiff is entitled to dismiss the individual claims (at least) without court order. In a class			
25	action, however, court approval of dismissal may be required under Rule 41(a)(2) if the class has			
26	been certified. Specifically, Rule 23(e) provides that any claims arising out of either a (1) "certified			
27	class" or (2) "class proposed to be certified for purposes of settlement may be settled, voluntarily			

dismissed, or compromised only with the court's approval." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) (emphasis added).

Case 1:20-cv-00530-JLT-CDB Document 122 Filed 12/11/25 Page 2 of 2

In this case, the parties seek to dismiss the individual claims with prejudice and the claims of the putative class without prejudice. (Doc. 121 at 3). No class has been certified in this action nor is there a class proposed to be certified for purposes of settlement. *Id.*; *see* (Doc. 1, 110). Because no class has been certified in this case, and because any dismissal would not affect putative class members' possible claims, Rule 23(e) does not mandate either Court approval of the parties' stipulation to dismiss the action or notice to putative class members. *See Titus v. BlueChip Financial*, 786 Fed. App'x. 694, 695 (9th Cir. 2019) ("Because no class has been certified, Titus is the only plaintiff before the court ...") (unpublished) (citing *Emp'rs-Teamsters Local Nos. 175 & 505 Pension Tr. Fund v. Anchor Capital Advisors*, 498 F.3d 920, 924 (9th Cir. 2007)).

In light of the parties' filing, the Court finds that Rule 23(e) does not require the Court's approval of the dismissal. This action shall be terminated by operation of law without further order of the Court. *Comm. Space Mgmt. Co., Inc. v. Boeing Co., Inc.*, 193 F.3d 1074, 1077-78 (9th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is HEREBY DIRECTED to CLOSE the case and adjust the docket to reflect, pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(ii), dismissal with prejudice as to Plaintiff's individual claims and without prejudice as to the putative class claims, with each party to bear that party's own attorney's fees and costs except as otherwise provided by the parties' settlement agreement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **December 11, 2025**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE